SFY 2021 ECBG RFP
Questions and Answers

Question 1: The Common Measure's Data Collection Plan template indicates a specific assigned measure for each outcome. Is this the only measure appropriate for the specific outcome?

> Answer 1: Complete the table as appropriate for your proposed service delivery model(s). If you will be collecting data in addition to the ECBG Common Measures, you can add rows to include that information. We do not expect each subsection to be addressed by every applicant. The outcome section should be viewed as a menu of options available for applicants to craft a plan that meets the needs of their community. We recognize that communities have existing programs funded through other sources that align with the ECBG outcomes and encourage applicants to describe those services in the narrative section.

Question 2: The grant proposal does not specify whether we could only serve children birth to three years of age for PAT home visiting. Can we serve children birth to kindergarten entry for PAT home visiting during the 2020-2021 ECBG grant year?

> Answer 2: There are no restrictions regarding any specific service delivery model.

Question 3: Regarding At-risk criteria, what maximum age defines "Teen parents)"?

> Answer 3: Up to and including age 19 at time of child's birth.

Question 4: One noticeable change in the RFP is the language regarding the children who can be served using ECBG funds. Previously, children could be served until kindergarten entry. Per the RFP on page 5, child can only be served until they are eligible for kindergarten (age 5 on or before August 31, 2020). For various reasons, many children do not start kindergarten when they are eligible. With this change in eligibility, children could potentially face a year with no services whatever if they do not start kindergarten when they are eligible. Please share the rationale behind this change. Will there be any exceptions to this with ECBG funds or is the Cabinet aware of any programs and funds that can be used to serve these children?

> Answer: The intent has not changed from previous ECBG RFPs but the language was revised to more clearly define "Children 3 to 5" and aligns with the eligibility criteria used by Head Start and the Kansas State Department of Education's Preschool-Aged At-Risk and Kansas Preschool Pilot programs. The eligibility requirements are set per the RFP approved by the Cabinet for SFY21 and programs can decide to use private funds or other sources to serve children not eligible for services with the ECBG funds.

Question 5: Please provide clarification on Attachment A: Grant Cover Page, Section F. We have received funding from the ECBG previously, so funding our request would actually be a continuation of services currently being offered in the community. However, continuation is not one of the options on the form. If current ECBG funding should be removed from the picture, then the proposed programs would likely be seen s as both expansion of what would be available without this funding and an enhancement of existing services. Is that correct?

> Answer 5: You may type in "Continuation" in that section.

Question 6: Are districts allowed to apply for this block grant even if they submit a grant application

for the Kansas Preschool Pilot grant and the Preschool-Aged At-Risk (State Pre-K 4-year-Old at-risk) grant for 2020- 2021?

Answer 6: We understand applicants will blend and braid funding and apply to a variety of funding sources to meet program needs. It is up to each applicant to develop a strong proposal that meets the criteria of our grant.

Question 7: Are other agencies able to apply for this block grant such as federal funded clinics and social agencies who work with families?

Answer 7: Eligible applicants should be experienced in providing service delivery models that yield positive outcomes to at-risk children from birth up to kindergarten entry and their families, including prenatal supports with a commitment to evidence-based, data-driven practices. Applicants should include within their proposal a community-informed, community-driven collaborative approach with partners from the private sector.

Eligible applicants may include:
- 501© (3) organizations
- County and city governments
- Unified School Districts (USDs)

Strong proposals will include:
- Plans based on community needs and data
- A focus on outcomes
- Public-private partnerships
- Improving quality and/or access to services
- A commitment to evidence-based, data-driven practices

Question 8: How is this Block Grant different from other Pre-K grants and what are the requirements?

Answer 8: For insight into the Early Childhood Block Grant, we encourage you to review the Blueprint for Early Childhood and background on the Kansas Children's Cabinet found here, https://kschildrenscabinet.org/blueprint-for-early-childhood/ . The specific grant requirements for our Early Childhood Block Grant are outlined in the RFP found here, https://kschildrenscabinet.org/grants/ .

Question 9: Would Head Start be considered a public partner since they are federally funded? Are examples of public partners that are requested for this grant schools, county agencies, etc.?

Answer 9: Head Start, schools and county agencies would be considered public partners.

Question 10: For the Required ECBG Outcomes section: Are we required to have a program that addresses each subsection and can we use one measurable or do we need to have a reporting outcome for each subsection? For each measurable? IE for "Strong Families" 2.2 do we need to be measuring both KIPS and PFS-2? Specifically, some guidance on how that applies to the "mixed delivery strategies" language?

Answer 10: We do not expect each subsection to be addressed by every applicant. The outcome section should be viewed as a menu of options available for applicants to craft a plan that meets the needs of their community. We recognize that communities have existing programs funded through other sources that align with the ECBG outcomes and encourage applicants to describe those services in the narrative section.

Question 11: Can our HOME component be measured through Infant and toddler services? In the past, we have been instructed to not have a Parents as Teachers component, can we bring them back in to help with some of these components?

> Answer 11: You are not required to have a component that uses the HOME. You are welcome to include Parents as Teachers as an element of your plan to meet your community need.

Question 12: Does each outcome measurable need a pre and post measurable or is a retrospective acceptable on some? Which have which requirement?

> Answer 12: The ASQ-3 and ASQ-SE2 are screeners and are not administered as a pre and post and current administration guidelines are as follows, "For *children 0 to 3 years old*, it is recommended children be *screened at each age interval* provided by the ASQ-3 and ASQ:SE-2. However, every child is required to be screened at least twice during the evaluation year. *Children 3 to 5 years old* are only required to be *screened once* during the evaluation year, unless the child scores in the referral or monitoring area(s) or if the provider and/or parent has concerns regarding the child's development." The PFS-2 has a pre-/post-test option and also a retrospective option. The HOME, KIPs and DECA are administered as a pre and post twice per year. The IGDI and myIGDI are administered three times per year. The CLASS is completed at least once and required a second time if the environment does not meet high quality in the first assessment.

Question 13: With regards to past performance: Where would reviewers like to see any references to past measurable and reports? IE Should WSU reports from past years should be referenced in the statement of needs section, project description or continuous improvement?

> Answer 13: You can reference past performance if applicable and use information from any reports given to you previously. This will vary depending on each applicant's proposal and it is up to you to decide how to utilize past reports in your application.

Question 14: With regards to funding sources: Can we have some specific examples of what the cabinet regards as Cash Contributions versus In-Kind? For example, can our district's indirect expenditures count towards the Cash Contribution section?

> Answer 14: State or federal funds cannot be used for match therefore the school district indirect expenditures would not count. Allowable cash match contribution examples would be a grant from a community foundation or funds raised from the private sector. Examples of in-kind match include things like the value of rent abatement for facilities or donations or discounts from a vendor.

Question 15: This year there are additional sections added into the narrative section as compared with previous recompete years. 2015 only had 4 sections required in its' narrative and this year has 6 sections but no change in the page count. Is there a shift in emphasis on what areas reviewers what to see greater input and are there areas where reviewers are looking for more succinct answers?

> Answer 15: This is not a recompete, this is a brand-new RFP. The Cabinet sought to provide clarity with the redesign of the application. Helpful tips for meeting the criteria include providing the organizational chart as an attachment (this does not count in the page limit) and using the points assigned and descriptions for each section as indicators of where emphasis will be placed.

Question 16: Can we and should we include an "extra" attachment that is a chart or something that shows what each of the community child cares are getting from the various grants to show no

duplication?

> Answer 16: We encourage you to be as clear and possible in your narrative. If we need clarifying information, the Cabinet will be in touch.

Question 17: During our team's conversation we looked at the Strong Families Outcome and feel like our project doesn't currently have any programming to meet these objectives. Given the Cabinet's desire to have evidence- based programs and our current lack of programming to meet the objective, the team thought it would be a good idea to request that PAT be the programming to meet that objective.

> Answer 17: We do not expect each subsection to be addressed by every applicant. The outcome section should be viewed as a menu of options available for applicants to craft a plan that meets the needs of their community. We recognize that communities have existing programs funded through other sources that align with the ECBG outcomes and encourage applicants to describe those services in the narrative section.

Question 18: Can we use our Federal Reimbursement Rate as our document to support the difference between it and the allowable 10% for indirects?

> Answer: Yes, you can use the Federal Reimbursement Rate as your documentation.

Question 19: Can we use a donor pledge card as our documentation for Cash Match?

> Answer: Yes, you can use a donor pledge card as your documentation.

Question 20: What will the forms look like that we will be using to report on Cash Match?

> Answer: The forms to be submitted monthly with the monthly grant transaction report are not yet completed.